

Application Number: 10/821,382

### Remarks

The examiner rejected claims 1-9, under 35 U.S.C. §102 and rejected claims 1-10, under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being indefinite. The examiner suggested that the previous amendment to the claims wherein it is recited that "R<sub>4</sub> is lower alkylamino heterocyclyl with the proviso that lower alkylamino defined herein is not para-substituted with -CH<sub>2</sub>NH- when Z is the phenyl ring" is not deemed to be persuasive. The examiner also suggested that the previous amendments of R<sub>4</sub>:

"aminoheterocyclyl with the proviso that heterocyclyl defined herein is not selected from N-lower alkylpyrrolidinyl or N-lower alkylpiperidinyl,

lower alkylamino heterocyclyl with the proviso that lower alkylamino defined herein is not para-substituted with -CH<sub>2</sub>NH- when Z is the phenyl ring" which lacks description in the specification as filed. As can be seen from present above amendments to the claims, these previous amendments of R<sub>4</sub> have been canceled. Therefore, these grounds for rejection have been obviated.

The examiner rejected claim 10, under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph, suggested that the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for a composition comprising a solvate or hydrate. As can be seen from the present above amendment, claim 10 has been canceled. Therefore, these grounds for rejection have been obviated.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the application is condition for allowance, so that a prompt and favorable response is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
GUOQING PAUL CHEN  
Tel: 626-482-9676  
Dated: January 8, 2007

